

Regeneration Committee - 13 October 2016

Item 7 - The Mayor's Civic Crowdfunding Programme

Navin Shah AM (Chair): Once again, can I welcome our guests to the meeting and invite members to introduce themselves?

Keith Townsend (Executive Director, Environment and Customer Services, London Borough of Ealing): Good afternoon, my name is Keith Townsend. I am Ealing Council's Executive Director for Environment and Customer Services.

Navin Shah AM (Chair): Thank you.

Debbie Jackson (Assistant Director, Regeneration, Greater London Authority (GLA)): Hello, I am Debbie Jackson, the Assistant Director of Regeneration here at City Hall.

Chris Gourlay (Founder and Chief Executive Officer, Spacehive): Hello, I am Chris Gourlay. I am the founder and Chief Executive Officer of Spacehive.

Navin Shah AM (Chair): Thank you.

Niraj Dattani (Head of Community Development, Spacehive): I am Niraj Dattani, the Head of Community Development at Spacehive.

Navin Shah AM (Chair): In addition to the four guests who - once again - are very welcome, we have Louise Armstrong from The Peckham Coal Line project coming in about 20 minutes' time. On that note, we can start our questions.

If I can address my opening question to Debbie Jackson, to generally give us some brief background and origins of the Civic Crowdfunding Programme (CPP) and why the Mayor adopted this particular approach to regeneration funding.

Debbie Jackson (Assistant Director, Regeneration, GLA): Yes, of course. Thank you, Chair. I will describe where the CPP came from and then give you an overview of how it works at the moment. One of the important points to make from the outset is that it has been a pilot programme. It has been a learning experience. We are starting to get to the stage of consolidating that learning with a view to launching a fuller and more scaled-up programme.

Bearing that in mind, the pilot emerged following a piece of research that we carried out in late 2014. This was a commissioned piece of research from the Future Cities Catapult. We looked into the potential for an open ideas platform at the Greater London Authority (GLA). In doing this we were looking at whether there was a case for developing a new model of 21st century governance that crowd sourced ideas from citizens in London and enabled those ideas to become embedded into our projects and programmes of work. We looked into the benefits of such an approach and we also looked into some of the challenges as well. Indeed, that work stream continues and that discussion continues today. A particular recommendation of that piece of work was that we

live trial a small-scale crowdsourcing and crowdfunding initiative, working in partnership with an appropriate online platform. Doing so would allow us to start to test and challenge some of the locally-led ideas and to integrate those ideas into our work. It would also test whether the public platform works and whether City Hall could interface with that kind of technology.

We established the pilot in partnership with Spacehive. In fact, the Future Cities Catapult recommended we work with Spacehive as there was a strong alignment between what it does and what we wanted to achieve. I will let them describe what they do when they get the stage. We worked in partnership with Spacehive. Certainly, initially it was a no-cost-to-City-Hall partnership. We recognised that there were things we both wanted to get out of that partnership so we worked together to develop the platform. Spacehive is a London-based new company. It is very innovative and was very willing to work collaboratively with us.

We developed the programme and through that we have now run three rounds of funding. Each time we have run a round of funding, we have developed the approach. Throughout those three rounds we have been working through a high street theme. The ideas we have invited Londoners to propose have been community-led ideas to regenerate and promote vitality and growth in London's high streets and town centres. As I said, we have iterated through the rounds. The first round was more about giving grants through the platform. Still crowdsourcing ideas but it was quite straightforward. We gave grants through the platform, so not really crowdfunded. The second element brought the crowdfunding to the fore. We crowdfunded alongside the Mayor's pledge. Therefore, in the second round, in effect, we made the Mayor one of the crowd. In the third round we actually encouraged community organisations to be actively crowdfunding before we brought the Mayor's pledge in. We have learnt from each round. We have addressed our processes and what we do through each round as well.

To pick up on a few of the points of the rationale for why we did this, part of our motivation was that we felt regeneration is something that Londoners should feel like they are part of. We wanted to provide opportunities for citizen-led initiatives rather than the traditional way we had worked that was very much through Government institutions. We wanted to, if you like, close the gap between City Hall and the local communities. We suspected that there was a lot of innovation out there that we were not getting to and that was not getting an opportunity to be surfaced. Certainly, when you hear from Louise [Armstrong] about the Peckham Coal Line, that is a really good example of that. We wanted to provide a 'shop window' for all of that creativity and innovation that exists amongst our communities. We also felt a responsibility as city government to reflect how our communities are working. We know through our work in regeneration that our communities are spectacularly well networked and very digitally enabled. That was something that we wanted to reflect and we felt a responsibility as city government to do so.

One of the outcomes of the programme is that it has produced a new wave of civic leaders. There are some really nice stories within the projects of people who have learnt a lot, have benefited and have developed confidence within their communities as well. Therefore, it has built capacity within communities as well. It has also provided an example of how City Hall and government institutions, can have more of a direct influence over what it is we do. It is also a good platform for public, private and third sector partnerships. Once we have the architecture of the platform up and running, it is a way that partners can engage with projects. Either on a project or probe, there are a number of ways that organisations can engage with the platform.

I might leave it there. I am not sure how well I have explained the platform. I am happy to go into that a little bit more if that would be helpful, but I might pause there.

Navin Shah AM (Chair): We will go into further details. I have a couple of follow-up questions. At this stage if I can bring in other guest members on whether they want to say from their experience and perspective how the programme has been functioning since its inception.

Niraj Dattani (Head of Community Development, Spacehive): As Debbie says, it has been an evolution as we have come in. Each time we do a funding round, there are lessons learnt and at City Hall the ambitions grow a bit larger. That is the way it should continue to develop.

From our point of view, as a platform, we have a mission and we want to make improving local places accessible to as many people as possible. We see this relationship with the GLA and the work we are doing with City Hall as a way of reaching lots of people within the capital, a city with a lot of creativity out there and a city where people care about the places they live in. Very much at the heart of what we do is to tap into that and to give people a voice, power and influence over shaping the areas they live in.

Navin Shah AM (Chair): Thank you. Keith, do you want to say anything from your perspective?

Keith Townsend (Executive Director, Environment and Customer Services, London Borough of Ealing): I will be led by you, Chair, if you want me to explain our experiences of crowdfunding or whether you want our response to the GLA?

Navin Shah AM (Chair): I have specific questions I will be raising on your projects in Ealing. Just generally, your thoughts on the value of such projects.

Keith Townsend (Executive Director, Environment and Customer Services, London Borough of Ealing): The general point I would make before going into the specifics about the Ealing experience is that it is not dissimilar from the GLA's experience. There are similar motives behind it. Perhaps that is something for local authorities and the GLA to consider, how they connect their thinking together in developing ideas. By coincidence we, as a borough, developed the crowdfunding project in a very similar way to the GLA and have learnt very similarly. There may be some benefits from the boroughs co-ordinating with the GLA in future depending on which direction this takes.

Navin Shah AM (Chair): Louise, you are very welcome to this Committee meeting.

Louise Armstrong (Catalyst, The Peckham Coal Line): Thank you.

Navin Shah AM (Chair): We are just on the initial line of questioning which is to talk broadly about how the programme has come about and the benefits and lessons learnt etc. We have heard general feedback from the GLA. I am asking the panel whether you want to say anything in terms of how you think - from your experience - the programme works and its benefits or challenges. We will be coming to your specific project later on but this is a broad-brush approach.

Louise Armstrong (Catalyst, The Peckham Coal Line): Thank you. I am part of a community project that has benefited from the GLA's crowdfunding programme. We have gathered a huge amount of benefit from that. Later I will talk a bit more about that. There is so much scope and so much potential for what more could be done, both for projects that have already gone through the crowdfunding processes and also to really stimulate and catalyse new projects as well. I am really excited about what this journey holds.

Navin Shah AM (Chair): Debbie, you talked about the pilot learning experience and also referred to challenges. Do you have any projects that you particularly might want to highlight as glowing success stories,

and also how the programme evolved over different rounds of funding? Two rounds have already been completed. You have three and four coming along. The third is pretty much underway. If you would like to talk in terms of main successes, how the programme has evolved over different rounds and what to expect in the fourth round, if you have got that far. Thank you.

Debbie Jackson (Assistant Director, Regeneration, GLA): Of course, thank you. In terms of successes, the Peckham Coal Line, obviously. I will tell you about some of the numbers so you get a sense of the scale of the programme across the three rounds we have done so far. We have had a total number of 191 submissions. That is 191 community and local groups who have pulled themselves together to submit an idea onto our platform. We have supported 53. We have to be very careful to only support what we can resource and the ones we think meet the criteria of the fund. Together those 191 projects demonstrate a project pipeline of £8 million. Everyone who does not get over the line of the mayoral pledge does get feedback on their proposal as well. They can always come back in future rounds. Therefore, it generates a pipeline and there is always support and feedback to the projects that are not supported. The Mayor has pledged £773,000. The crowd has outdone the Mayor by raising £966,000. In terms of leverage, it is a really exciting way of making our money work really hard as well.

What is really interesting is the journey that we have been on across the rounds. You asked me to speak about the evolution. Across all three rounds we have had 5,694 backers. That is 5,694 individual decisions to put money into projects in the local community. Just to be clear, this is not crowdfunding where you get something back. There are various platforms where you crowdfund and you maybe get a meal at a restaurant or the first edition of a book. This is about crowdfunding into projects in your local community. The payback for you is seeing something you believe in coming forward and something that you want to see for your local community. It is really powerful that there are 5,700 individual decisions to back.

Regarding the journey across the rounds, for every pound the Mayor put in in Round 1, the crowd put in £1.59. In Round 2 the crowd put in £2.54, and in Round 3 it was £2.95. As the crowdfund becomes better known and is better communicated - we are all getting better at networking this opportunity amongst London's communities - it is gathering momentum. Round 1, as I mentioned earlier, was not really a crowdfund so much. Round 1 had 78 backers. There are about 20 projects per round so the Mayor puts in 20 pledges per round. In Round 1 there were 78 backers, in Round 2 there were 2,244 backers and in Round 3 there were 3,374 backers. It is that journey that I find really interesting. We also find that once a project gets the mayoral pledge - or the promise of a pledge because, of course, it does not get drawn down until they hit their target - the crowdfunding rate accelerates. Once you get the nod from the Mayor, that project has the ability to go out and communicate that, "We have got a pledge from the Mayor's office". That really does - Louise [Armstrong] can speak about this, I am sure - help give the project maybe some credibility and maybe have people sit up and take notice a little bit more. We find that the rate of crowdfunding roughly triples from that point onwards.

Nearly all of our projects have succeeded so far. Nearly all of them have met their crowdfunding target. In Round 3, 19 out of 20 projects met their crowdfunding targets. Of course, we monitor the success of those projects in City Hall because it is public money but what is far more terrifying to the delivery partners is that they are being monitored by their local community. There is nothing quite so compelling as your community - Louise cannot walk down the street in Peckham now - wanting to know how things are going. Because it is linked in through social media, the project tells a story and keeps a story going. That is something that has evolved through the programme.

I will give you a couple of examples of projects - I do not know if you have had a chance to look at the platform - to give you an idea of the kind of projects we have supported. One would be Twist, which is Twist

on Station Rise in Tulse Hill. This is just outside the station on a stretch of previously unused land and is a monthly market to help the underemployed try to incubate trading and trade business at low cost and low risk. It is removing all of the entry barriers to trying out trading on a market. It was something that really did involve the local community and was a really lovely project. Another is a new playground on Redbridge High Street. It updated the previous equipment that had been in place for more than 15 years, with a particular focus on providing for the disabled. One of the core beliefs of the work that we do on high streets is that they need to be places to do much more than just shop. They need to be places to visit and you need to be able to go there for all sorts of reasons. The new playground very much responds to that in providing a resource for communities. Another example is a dilapidated and empty shop in Surbiton that was turned into a community museum with a public use industrial kitchen in the back to help food business incubation. I have not seen this one but I believe it has got to be seen to be believed. It is an extraordinary local project. You guys will know it better than I will. It is those kinds of things, really creative and very well networked local projects.

I spoke earlier about how the programme has evolved so maybe I will not take any more time on that. I am happy to come back on any questions.

In terms of the Chair's question about where we are now, you are quite right that we are in Round 3. Nineteen of the 20 projects have met their crowdfunding target. They are in the process of entering into grant. One of the things that is particularly gratifying for me is that that process is getting quicker each round. We are getting smarter. We are working out our processes and we are working with Spacehive to make it as soon as possible. They are getting into grant. Lots of them have already delivered and are claiming their funding. The whole machine is working more quickly and a lot more efficiently.

We have some funding left in the budget to run a final round of this programme that we would hope to be in the New Year. We also have bid to Government for some funding for a scaling-up and continuation of this programme. It is not really a continuation because what we will be doing is taking the opportunity to consolidate what we have learnt and launch a product taking into account all of that learning. We should hear about that funding as part of the autumn statement. We will be a lot clearer within a month or so what scale of programme we will be delivering going forward.

A couple of other points about the successes as well, I mentioned a little bit about the role of London government. This project was recognised at the World Government Summit in Dubai as one of eight projects being exemplars in government innovation. It has not just got the attention of our local communities, it has actually got the attention of governments around the world. It has improved our knowledge and understanding of local organisations which is invaluable. It is something that we are working very much with other teams in City Hall on as well. It has given us a much better understanding of how to work with communities. I have spoken a little bit about the value for money and making every pound that the Mayor has work as hard as possible. In Round 3 for the first time we worked with the Food team. The Food team contributed some funding and we invited projects with a particular emphasis on food. That worked really well. It shows how we can use the programme to address City Hall priorities.

Finally, we have done some work with the GLA Intelligence team looking at the social impact of what we are doing, the social and community success. That has shown that the programme is delivering very strong social benefit. It is changing people's lives in small and quite significant ways. There are examples within the programme of people that have actually gone on to get jobs or demonstrate these skills that enable them to take different paths or pursue careers that perhaps they would not have previously. There are successes at all levels. Sometimes it is as simple as confidence building and building networks in the community. However, there are some people who are gaining some real skills for the workplace and fundraising. Louise [Armstrong]

can talk more about this, I am sure. We are continuing that research into the social impact of the programme as well.

Tony Devenish AM: My question is really about the process of how you got to where you are. I am still a little unclear on the screenshot in terms of how you encourage people to go for it and the evaluation process of why project A succeeds and project B gets sent back to the drawing board. You got 191 submissions but obviously there are millions of Londoners and lots and lots of communities. How do you communicate this opportunity to people broadly across London? Are you worried that perhaps you have focused on certain bits of London and other bits of London are not in the papers at all?

Debbie Jackson (Assistant Director, Regeneration, GLA): To address your process points, first of all let me explain how the platform works. Simply put, if a community group looks on the website they will find criteria there that describe what we are looking for and how we will decide which projects will attract a pledge from the Mayor. The community group posts their idea on the website. It is intended to be very open and transparent. It is not sending something in to City Hall that we then do behind closed doors. The idea gets posted on the website and then the organisation is encouraged to seek support through social media. Support can be pledges but also people interacting with the project in social media through comments. There is a deadline. By that deadline we want the projects to be posted there. We would also want them to be demonstrating community support through pledges and visible evidence of people supporting the project. Then we evaluate the projects here in City Hall with a team from across the organisation against the criteria that we have posted. The kinds of things we look for are the outcomes the project will deliver and deliverability as we do not want to set people up to fail; we want to be reassured they have the capacity and ability to deliver what they are saying they are going to deliver.

There have been about 20 projects per round that we offer a pledge to. We pledge up to 75% of the project up to £20,000. There is a maximum of £20,000 available for up to 75% of the project. In practice, we have rarely given £20,000 and we rarely give 75% and most of our projects have hit their crowdfunding target. From the point that we tell them they have that pledge if they hit their target, their clock starts ticking. Then they go out and crowdfund like crazy. The pledges then come in. There is a deadline that they set themselves but obviously we need to be happy with it. They have to hit their target by that deadline. If they do not hit the target, then none of the pledges get drawn down. If they hit the target, then the pledges get drawn down and then we move into grant and they deliver. That is how the process works.

In terms of communicating the opportunity, each time we launch a round we do what we classically do in City Hall with press releases and try to get it into the press. Far more importantly, we use our networks through local authorities and through social media and the internet to advertise the opportunity. Spacehive is hugely helpful in this. Because of what it does, it is very well networked in local communities as well. As I said, the success of the programme and the journey it has gone on demonstrates that people are getting to know about it. We could always do more. In future rounds we would like to do more campaigning and be more high profile. We have purposefully had a reasonably 'white label' project so far because it has been a pilot. If we are successful in securing the funding through the [Chancellor of the Exchequer's] Autumn Statement, we will look at making the programme much more high profile. It is something that is fairly well-known amongst London's communities, although I do acknowledge the challenge that it is more well-known in some communities than others. That is something we are also very mindful of. For example, Peckham does very well. The Peckham Coal Line and Peckham Lido have had the most pledges to their projects because that community knows how to interact with it and it is a reasonably affluent community. We do know that other communities that do not have those characteristics do struggle more. Therefore, that is something we would like to do more work on if we get the opportunity to scale up the programme.

Fiona Twycross AM: I was going to ask about the affluence of the communities or the mix of the communities. Giving it another context with food banks, food banks flourish most where there are quite affluent communities alongside communities where people are struggling more, so there is that mix. It is about how you break through that and how you empower people who do not have that ability to be vocal. It is the noisy members of a community – all respect to the people who have managed to get funding for very valuable projects – who get funding. I have another question, but it is distinctly different, about the amounts of money people have been giving and the change in that pattern. However, maybe we will start with how you are looking at moving it away from the areas where you have affluent communities.

Debbie Jackson (Assistant Director, Regeneration, GLA): What we have not done so far is been prescriptive about who or where can bid in. We could do but we have not done that so far. What we have asked people to demonstrate when they submit their proposals is that what they are going to deliver will be inclusive for local communities and will not appeal to just one target group which is the most obvious. We do look at the ability of projects to appeal to the community that they are situated within.

There are three parts in answering your question; the project proposers, the pledgers, and then there are the customers of the project in the end. What we are testing through the criteria is that the project will be inclusive for the customers at the end. Something we are mindful of is enabling communities who perhaps are not as digitally enabled and perhaps will not interface with the technology as much. We have done some workshops in local areas to try to draw out less obvious members of the community. We have had some quite nice examples of that in this round. People who perhaps would not have thought it was for them and would not have thought they could do this. We do have resources available – both within my team and through some limited consultancy support – to help people get over that line as well. There is no doubt that it is easier to do in some communities than others. However, we have been trying and will continue to develop on this – it is why we have done the research into the social impact – to think about what other tactics we can do to include communities in all of those three groups at all stages. That is because a £1 pledge is as important as a £1,000 pledge to a project. That is a message we really need to get out there. For somebody who is proposing a project one of the most important things to them is the community they are working with.

Fiona Twycross AM: When you are looking at it, the numbers of people you think are going to pledge is important. I was looking at the figures and have done a calculation on my phone's calculator. For Round 1 the average pledge must have been something over £4,500 and then it is coming down.

Debbie Jackson (Assistant Director, Regeneration, GLA): It was very much from institutions and local authorities. It was not really what we wanted it to be.

Fiona Twycross AM: You have answered the question really because in Round 3 the average was coming down to £157 and then for the Peckham project it was more around the £80 mark. What is the range of donations that people are pledging?

Niraj Dattani (Head of Community Development, Spacehive): It might be helpful if I give a bit of context to this as to how Spacehive works nationwide. We partner with lots of local authorities; Ealing [Council] is one of them. There is a perception that this may be used in the more affluent areas rather than in the other areas of the authority. Actually 75% of our projects are in the bottom half of the Index of Multiple Deprivation, the bottom 50%. That is because the need is greater in those areas and the communities are more united in those areas. Therefore, when you do start a campaign that essentially tries to get lots of people to pledge for something that improves a community space, it is much easier to do. Interestingly, the areas where we have had a lower number of projects are boroughs like Kensington and Chelsea, Hammersmith and

Fulham. We have not had that many projects there. If you go to somewhere like Lewisham, we have had over 70 projects just there. That is one point.

It is not really the case that individuals and communities are expected to front up these sums of money to fund these projects. Louise's [Armstrong] project was £60,000. Could we expect the community of individuals in Peckham to fund that £60,000? No, we could not. 90% of our funders are individuals but they only account for 10% of the money. What you see is a lot of people putting in £5, £10 or £20. That sign - that local people really want something to happen in their community and they are prepared to vote with their wallets - is what is the most powerful. That leverages in your contributions from local authorities, property developers, housing associations, local businesses, corporates, brands and even the Mayor. That is why the GLA looks at that as an indicator of how much the community want something to happen in their area.

Chris Gourlay (Founder and Chief Executive Officer, Spacehive): It is worth knowing that with respect to achieving the funding target it is not all about money. The platform facilitates the provision of contributions of 'in kind', resource, stuff and skills. A lot of projects go through a process of trying to source those sorts of materials directly from the community, getting the community to sweat its assets to help reduce the cost that you need to raise online. It is one of the ways that the process can be made more accessible. As Debbie [Jackson] mentioned, there is a lot more that could be done on that front. Fundamentally, it is about trying to make the barrier to entry for participation in these sorts of campaigns as low as it can be.

Andrew Dismore AM: This seems to be one of the best-kept secrets in London. I knew very little about it until I got the papers for this meeting. It seems to be that once you are in the know in certain areas then you are in the know and you sweat the scheme. If nobody in your area has one, how do you know about it? How do you know how to access it? You said about using social media and that sort of stuff earlier on, but there does not seem to me to have been any real drive to try to extend this scheme to areas that are low penetration or zero penetration, rather than going back to areas which are already successful with it and getting more and more of the success, as we have had some examples this morning. What are you doing to try to promote this into areas where there is very little or no penetration?

Debbie Jackson (Assistant Director, Regeneration, GLA): I like the best-kept secret thing. To be clear, we do not go back and promote it to the areas we have been before. We promote it to all of London. We do that through our networks.

Andrew Dismore AM: It does not seem to be getting through though, does it?

Debbie Jackson (Assistant Director, Regeneration, GLA): I take the point. As I said, it has been a pilot so we have wanted to be mindful of the scale of it.

Andrew Dismore AM: Secret.

Debbie Jackson (Assistant Director, Regeneration, GLA): We did not want to keep it secret at all. All being well, we will be looking to shout from the rooftops in every way - using all of the resources that City Hall has available to it to do that - when we relaunch it. We certainly do not target the same areas. There is an element of self-selecting.

Andrew Dismore AM: Is that not part of the problem?

Debbie Jackson (Assistant Director, Regeneration, GLA): One of the things we will look to do when we announce the next round is look at that and look at the areas that have not seen projects. What

Niraj [Dattani] says is a really interesting point. He is right, we do not see many projects from the more affluent parts of London. Is that not a good thing?

Fiona Twycross AM: There are quite high levels of affluence within some of these areas. That is the key thing Andrew is driving at.

Andrew Dismore AM: Equally, there are quite high levels of deprivation in areas that are perceived to be affluent. It works both ways. The first I heard about the last round was when something came around Assembly Members saying, "This round closes in a week's time", which did not give me much chance to try to promote it in my constituency, bearing in mind how large our constituencies are. Are you, for example, communicating to ward councillors when the round starts? Ward councillors have often got their feet on the ground with a good idea of what needs to be done in their particular patch. They are probably the most linked in to their local communities and have networks. It seems to me to have a list of all the ward councillors in London and know how to contact them would be a pretty good way of announcing the start of it, not just putting something out, "There is only a week to go, get your bid in now", that is what came around last time. That is pretty pointless.

Chris Gourlay (Founder and Chief Executive Officer, Spacehive): Can I add something in terms of context? These are absolutely fair criticisms. There is so much more we can do to promote this opportunity and reach into communities where there is not that natural traction and natural awareness.

It is worth just pointing out the context of what we have been focusing on over the first year of the pilot. If we take a step back, people are - irrespective of what the Mayor is doing here in City Hall - starting to crowdfund regeneration projects on their own. This is a thing that is happening. There are 415 projects around the city and many more around the United Kingdom. People have clocked onto the idea that you can put up projects, you can verify that these things are deliverable and you can start to collaborate to get these things funded across citizens, businesses, local trusts and, on occasion, municipalities.

The context of this was us trying to work together and think about how the Mayor can play a really powerful role in catalysing this activity, fuelling it, ensuring that this activity develops, that it is inclusive and fair and that as many Londoners as possible are able to participate in it. It is so we really sweat the assets of this incredible city so that its citizens are able to come forward with ideas, and that the wealth that exists in this place is able to flow into these ideas that have so much potential to deliver quality of life and local economic benefits.

For the first year and a half it has been figuring out what it would look like to have a municipality collaborate with the crowd to fund these projects - pretty much spontaneously - online in this completely different way. That is not straightforward. It is not a question of taking the existing model of crowdfunding popularised through the likes of Kickstarter and giving it a civic brand. There are some very tricky mechanical process and governance challenges to be thought through to make that work effectively and in a way which is inclusive and accessible to people. I wanted to point that out by way of context. Those are the sorts of things we have been grappling with in the first year. We have made big steps but we have much more to do. We are starting to emerge to the point where we can start to think about accessibility, branding and social impact. There are a lot of really exciting opportunities there.

Andrew Dismore AM: If you look at the map we have on page 23 of this evaluation resource, [*Understanding the social impact of the Mayor's Crowdfunding Programme*] a qualitative retrospective, it does look at bit zone 1-ish in terms of applications, both successful and unsuccessful. It is virtually non-existent in large swathes of outer London. It seems to me that a lot of people do not even know how to get off first base

in terms of how to start crowdfunding. When I suggested it to somebody with a week to go, they said, “Where do I start? How do I do this? What do I do? How do I get this off the ground?” It seems to me you are assuming a level of knowledge, activity and engagement that is beyond where a lot of people are.

Debbie Jackson (Assistant Director, Regeneration, GLA): We do not assume that. As Chris said, we can always do more. However, we did take workshops out to local communities. We do tell the local authorities and ask them to communicate it. Without a doubt we could do more but we certainly do not assume that people either know about it or have the skills to do it from day one. We also have my team and resources available. If somebody has an idea we say, “Even if you do not know what to do with it, call us. We will talk you through it and see if we can help you get there”. We have quite a hands-on approach.

Andrew Dismore AM: Assuming they know about you in the first place.

Debbie Jackson (Assistant Director, Regeneration, GLA): Yes. Like I said, we can always do more. It has been a learning experience. I will be honest; a lot of hard work has gone into it this year as well.

Andrew Dismore AM: I am not disputing that. My only concern is that it seems to be very central London focused, apart from Kensington and Chelsea of course.

Shaun Bailey AM (Deputy Chair): As someone who lives in an outer borough but represents all of London, it looks very right on in central. We do not have the same vibrant, physically close-together communities and amenity groups that are in central London. I used to live in central London. I have moved to the edge very recently. That is one of the differences I note.

You made the comment earlier on that you are out there, as it were, and are, quite frankly, relying on people’s initiative. Would it not be useful to assume a lower level of initiative and chase a few people? There are many amenity groups – the local council in particular because it is very plugged in – and would it not be useful to go out to those people as a deliberate action and say, “This is what we are doing. We would like you to be aware of it. Is there anybody in your communities you think we should be talking to?” London is a big place. You are never going to get to know everyone but you do know mechanisms who do know everyone.

Debbie Jackson (Assistant Director, Regeneration, GLA): That is a good comment. Yes, absolutely. I should stress there are some great projects in outer London as well.

Andrew Dismore AM: Fine. However, looking at this map in Hillingdon, there is not a single application, successful or unsuccessful; in Harrow, one unsuccessful application; and Barnet, one successful application. These are big boroughs and big populations. In Enfield, there are three unsuccessful applications. So it goes on all around outer London. We need to be doing a bit more work in outer London.

Navin Shah AM (Chair): I am mindful of time. I would like to move on to the next package of questions. Before I do that, just a comment that already Members have picked up this particular report from the GLA Intelligence team [*Understanding the social impacts of the Mayor’s Crowdfunding Programme a qualitative retrospective*]. There are some interesting conclusions and recommendations. Some do prove the comments and concerns that Members have raised already. I hope those are being actively looked at and also that they are part and parcel of what we do and do not do for the next rounds. You might want to comment in detail through the written channels outside this meeting.

On that note, if we can move on to the next set of questions on the Peckham Coal Line Project.

Fiona Twycross AM: I would stress that when we look at outer London, perhaps we could do more rather than less of this sort of stuff, in case we have been sounding a bit negative.

Navin Shah AM (Chair): I will endorse that.

Fiona Twycross AM: I have been looking at where I am particularly focused as well. Louise, it is a really interesting project and I enjoyed reading about it. I just wondered if you could tell us a bit about what the main challenges have been in getting the project up and running and what kind of benefits you have seen as the project has been developed.

Louise Armstrong (Catalyst, The Peckham Coal Line): Yes, sure. The Peckham Coal Line is, as you have probably read, a really ambitious project that was generated by people locally. It is always difficult to know, as I was saying, how you start to do this kind of thing when you do not necessarily have experience of doing these things. We started talking to people, a couple of councillors, going along to some local meetings and sharing the idea. It seemed to get traction. The very first thing we did was create a Facebook page and see what happened. We were overwhelmed at just how much interest emerged from that. Our local paper, *The Peckham Peculiar*, wrote an article and then we started having people emailing saying, "This is amazing. How can I help make it happen?"

This sort of stuff was bubbling for about two or three months, and then someone told us about the High Street Fund and the crowdfunding opportunity. We were quite excited about it. We felt quite nervous about it because we were quite new but it was a great way to push the project forward. By us doing it, it probably sped up our journey by a couple of years. We could have just been speaking to people for a long time and not moved far. The crowdfunding gave us an opportunity to ramp that up. It was helping to bring it to life in a very tangible way. By having a target, by having deadlines and by having three months to raise money, it gave us a reason to go and speak to lots of different people in the community.

It is worth saying that yes, the online component is really important but it is going out to speak to people that really drives these things and really makes them happen. The Peckham Coal Line became a platform for people right across Peckham to come and meet people they would never have met before, giving them a platform for conversation, which is really great. It was not just about the money, it was about bringing people together and feeling like they can own something, feeling like they can be part of the change that is happening in the area. They do not to have it enforced on them. They can own it. They can have a part in it. Of course, the money has a part to play but that is only part of the story.

We met so many people through the events we ran as part of the crowdfunding campaign. They have time and they could volunteer; for example, clearing up in the nature reserve part of the area. A lady, Jeanette, for example, said, "I cannot give you any money but I am happy to tell my neighbours about what you are doing and come along to volunteer sessions". There is quite a lot of support that does not get captured by the platform already. Maybe there is something about how we tell those stories as well, because they are just as important.

It gave us an opportunity to connect with people whom you would not otherwise. That can be the challenge of community projects. How do you go and talk to someone whom you have no connections with or when you have a completely different worldview? These sorts of projects allow you to open up those conversations. As I mentioned, we had about 200 people email saying, "I want to volunteer my time". It was amazing to realise there is so much talent that is latent within the communities that you can tap into. This sort of project can help you find those. It is difficult to maintain these sorts of things but we definitely have a network of local people that are bringing their skills to these sorts of projects to bring them to life, which is really powerful. We

are learning from each other. I have learnt so much from my neighbours. As Debbie [Jackson] mentioned, I walk down the street and I now know many more people than I did before, which is really powerful.

It was also about how a community group gets taken seriously by bigger players and bigger stakeholders. We were an unknown community group. How do we start a conversation with the GLA and the Mayor of London? How do we start a conversation with Southwark? The crowdfunding gave us, again, a platform to start those stakeholder conversations.

Fiona Twycross AM: Can I ask how you heard about it? This goes back to the point that other people have been talking about. How did you hear about the funding in the first place?

Louise Armstrong (Catalyst, The Peckham Coal Line): It was a volunteer quite early on who knew about the programme. She heard about it and shared it as an opportunity.

Fiona Twycross AM: You already had the idea in mind and then somebody who was volunteering said, “I think this is --”

Louise Armstrong (Catalyst, The Peckham Coal Line): “Why do we not do this as the next thing we do?”

Fiona Twycross AM: That is interesting. Thank you.

Louise Armstrong (Catalyst, The Peckham Coal Line): The idea was only about six months old by that point so it was quite early on. We had a bit around the concept. What it did was it gave us a structure to work towards. With community groups it can be quite disorganised and deadlines slip because life gets in the way. Crowdfunding gives you a structure. It gives you deadlines. That was really helpful. I know the GLA were worried that there was too much structure but we need some of it to keep you moving. That really helped.

On that stakeholder point, what it now means is that we have come as equals to the table. We are working with the GLA and with Southwark Council. Both of you pledged, which was really brilliant. We are working with Network Rail on the development of the project. The crowdfunding unlocked that process, which is amazing and probably one of the best outcomes that come out of it from us. It is opening up that conversation with the community. We were running events and we were bringing people together. That was probably the biggest impact that it has had.

Fiona Twycross AM: Thank you. How have you managed people’s expectations? Just looking at what the project involves at the moment, it is around feasibility and working up the plans for the project. How have you managed people’s expectations? They have obviously pledged and funded a part of it. Presumably, at the moment, there is absolutely no guarantee that the project as you are envisaging it will go ahead. How have you managed people’s expectations around that?

Louise Armstrong (Catalyst, The Peckham Coal Line): It is just about being honest and sharing the journey. We are learning in public, we are doing this in public, so at each step we always make a point of going out to the crowdfunders, telling them what is happening and inviting their opinion into the feasibility study as well. This is not about experts going away and doing it, it is about generating it together. Yes, communications, transparency and regularly going out and being clear about what people can expect or not expect.

Fiona Twycross AM: Thank you. In terms of building the project going forward, do you envisage that crowdfunding could be scaled up for this project or do you think you will be looking for more traditional types of grant funding for this?

Louise Armstrong (Catalyst, The Peckham Coal Line): The feasibility study was crowdfunding. It is helping us explore that. If it is to go ahead, we are imagining it would be a whole suite of funding that needs to come together. In the spirit of the collaborative nature that it was born out of, crowdfunding could play a part in what comes next but I am not imagining it would be the only thing. I am not sure local people can afford that type of project but in terms of how you engage people and give that sense of ownership, definitely. There are examples internationally where projects have been built using crowdfunded money. We are looking for those examples as well.

Fiona Twycross AM: Thank you. How do you see this project as helping the overall regeneration of Peckham?

Louise Armstrong (Catalyst, The Peckham Coal Line): It is around people getting to steer the change, people not having change done to them, and people feeling like they can contribute to the direction that things are happening in. Even before the project exists, they are being able to meet each other. You are building a community around the project. If it does not come about, you have already created new connections that would not exist otherwise. That makes the community really resilient. That is how it is contributing.

Fiona Twycross AM: Thank you, and apologies that I am going to have to leave shortly. This has been fascinating.

Andrew Dismore AM: How much capital do you need to raise to do this?

Louise Armstrong (Catalyst, The Peckham Coal Line): The feasibility study will help us work that out. We have not quite got to that yet.

Navin Shah AM (Chair): Can you let us know, if possible, some figures? If you can write in, it would be helpful. Obviously capital funding and making it a reality would be very helpful.

Fiona Twycross AM: She said the feasibility study has not finished yet, has it?

Louise Armstrong (Catalyst, The Peckham Coal Line): No, it is not finished.

Navin Shah AM (Chair): No. OK. It is very early days, you are saying.

Louise Armstrong (Catalyst, The Peckham Coal Line): Yes. I would not want to say --

Navin Shah AM (Chair): You are not in a position.

Louise Armstrong (Catalyst, The Peckham Coal Line): Yes.

Navin Shah AM (Chair): OK. Fair enough.

Andrew Dismore AM: Fine. When you know, you know. One of the concerns I have about some of these things is that you raise a lot of expectations and then you find the price tag at the end is enormous, either you

cannot get the capital together or it takes years to get the capital together, and it starts to have a negative effect. People start to fall away and think, "What was all that about?" How are you going to bridge that gap between expectation and delivery, which may never happen, and the period of time it will take?

Louise Armstrong (Catalyst, The Peckham Coal Line): That is a fair point. How are we creative about the process? Let us not wait until we have lots of money and do it. We are already starting. We have a little sub-project called Grow the Line which is about building some planters that community groups can put plants into. We are starting to make it real way before we have a final product. There will be a series of little projects that, over time, accumulates to the bigger thing. It is not about stopping and waiting for five years. There is a huge amount we can do, bringing the community together as part of that process to build it up and integrate over time.

Chris Gourlay (Founder and Chief Executive Officer, Spacehive): It is worth just briefly adding to that. The Peckham Coal Line is slightly unusual in the sense that the crowdfunding focused on generating a feasibility study, which in turn would then establish the full capital cost of the project. 90% of projects are not like that. When they hit their funding target, they are delivered and the tangible project emerges off the back of that. In this case, it is almost thinking about it as start-up funding for an idea that would perhaps struggle to get off the first blocks if it had not been for the willingness of the community to come together with the Mayor and others to give it that leg up.

Navin Shah AM (Chair): While we are on funding, do you reckon that the current profile of funders reflects the diversity of Peckham?

Louise Armstrong (Catalyst, The Peckham Coal Line): Yes, I do, to some extent. As I say, it is recognising that it is not just about the people who put money in their pockets, it is about the people who were helping to promote the project. It was the people who were sharing it with their neighbours. If you look at that perspective, then absolutely. We have spoken to schoolkids about it. They do not have the money to put into an online platform. We have been to tenants' and residents' associations as well and spoken to them, and been to different churches and faith groups to talk about the project. We have made a real, conscious effort to do that reaching out because the project is not going to be successful unless we have that basis.

Shaun Bailey AM (Deputy Chair): Mine is a slight observation. I have been involved in community work my whole life. One of the problems about community work is that it is the same community all the time. You have the people who have the expertise who then get to lead everything so you end up using your community's human capital to deliver their desires. You always get the friends of some park which seems to be close to the lovely middle-class area and miles away from where you live, but they use your existence to get the council to get something to happen. It seems to me that the platform slightly lacks. It does not talk about the human element of it. I have looked at the platform and it has not jumped out at me how I could be involved, other than the fact that I might have some money or not. That is very important.

Two things. For a project, do you directly ask people just for their expertise? Can you say to a community, "We are looking for an accountant or a bricklayer" or something like that? How much effort is made to leave some of that expertise behind? As someone who has worked with young people my whole life, the rule of what you do for young people is educate. You give them the opportunity to be involved. I come from a community where we are not in charge of anything so any opportunity to be involved in a decision-making process is quite developmental. I wonder if that backstory is told enough. You may get other amenity groups and other people more involved if they understood that work was going on.

Chris Gourlay (Founder and Chief Executive Officer, Spacehive): That is a very fair point. As I mentioned before, our initial focus was on trying to get the basic mechanics of how you get grant funding and crowdfunding working in a civic context, how you verify these projects to ensure they can be viably delivered, and how you get strangers and established institutions to collaborate online. We are emerging past that phase and we will definitely be spending a lot more time focusing on how we can broaden access to these sorts of projects.

You are absolutely right that it is not just about the money. We do have a feature at the moment that is called the Wish List. It allows projects to say, "Prior to and during fundraising, these are some of the things we would love to have help with". It could be skills in helping to develop a business plan or it could be somebody who might be able to give you free bricks or a bench, whatever it is you are looking for. People can then come from the community or organisations and make offers against that wish list, either for things that specifically match those requests or other ideas. This has started to become a very popular tool. We just opened it up a couple of months ago. It is one of the ways in which people are able to source non-financial contributions.

The other thing we are really keen to do is to provide people with tool kits locally so they can run their own on-the-ground fundraising and community engagement events. It is not just about the online activity. It is just recognising that this is not an online-only dogma. This is about trying to make it as easy as possible for as many people as possible to participate, to create the ideas and to back them, and we will look for every single way to do that to make sure it is genuinely participatory. The context of this is that previously if you were in a community and you needed to access a resource to do an ambitious project like Louise's [Armstrong], you would typically be going through a grant funding process with a lot of applications and so on and so forth, the impact records and the forecasting and so on. This is not necessarily that accessible for a lot of people. As you say, often you end up dealing with similar audiences who come back because they are familiar with those sorts of tools. Our big push is just trying to widen that process so we can have as many people as possible involved, and it is something we are really keen to continue focusing on.

The final point just to pick up: you mentioned young people. We have seen some amazing examples of young people getting involved in projects, both contributing in terms of their skills and their time and helping and coming along to workshops, but also leading them. We have some specific programmes - not in this case supported by the Mayor, but companies like Barclays and others, UnLtd most recently, the foundation specifically offering up funding to help young people lead these sorts of projects to transform local spaces. The skills that you acquire as a young person doing that from your budgeting, your project management, the marketing and the community engagement are really phenomenal. There is a really rich seam there that we might be able to learn from as well.

Debbie Jackson (Assistant Director, Regeneration, GLA): A couple of points just to amplify that. In a couple of lines of inquiry we are looking at in the development of the next stage, one of them is a conversation with Team London in terms of how we can collaborate and have access to their networks and their expertise in terms of volunteering. That is one of the conversations we are having. We have also been specifically thinking about young people and the part that they play in their local communities, and whether we could have a dedicated programme or a programme specifically targeting young people and supporting young people in bringing forward and supporting projects as well. We have been looking at that too.

Navin Shah AM (Chair): OK, thank you.

Tony Devenish AM: Louise, have I been clear here when I have read this and read this again? Is this a street-scape CAPEX [capital expenditure] built environment project? I apologise on behalf of being a typical CAPEX guy by background - local councillor - but that is basically what it is, isn't it, broadly?

Louise Armstrong (Catalyst, The Peckham Coal Line): That is one part of it. It is a multifaceted project.

Tony Devenish AM: Brilliant. You have answered. That is great. Can I ask Debbie? When I read this, I almost fell over on page seven because, certainly as a Westminster councillor, if I saw a project which comes to £64,000, and £35,000 is for a feasibility study, my first question would be, where is that £35,000 going? Is it, to quote some of my colleagues on both my left and my right, going to a middle-class consultant who is making a lot of money out of this? Or is it a value-for-money bit? In Westminster, we are very cynical about these things. We push back and basically say, "You do it for free", pretty much, "and then you get the next project".

Debbie Jackson (Assistant Director, Regeneration, GLA): Louise is probably best placed to answer about the commissioning, but let me just say that when projects propose, part of the information that they need to give to us is what the money will be spent on, and that needs to be quite a detailed breakdown of what will be delivered. As part of the evaluation that I mentioned before, we do scrutinise that and we will push back if we feel like elements of the work are not representing value for money.

In terms of the commissioning, again, the processes that we would expect people to go through, we would expect them to represent value for money as well. I do not know what consultants Louise used.

Louise Armstrong (Catalyst, The Peckham Coal Line): We did do a community tendering process, if there is such a thing, and we were learning quite a lot from the council and from the GLA about what that process looks like, but designing it to be appropriate for public crowdfunded money. We put a brief out. We did quite a rigorous shortlisting, we interviewed, and we went through all of that process in order to get the right people to work with.

Tony Devenish AM: I will not labour the point for here, but I agree with one of my colleagues who said really the outcomes should be in this round of the funding and not a feasibility report. Crowdfunding to get a feasibility report, all the points about management expectations: quite worrying, really. I hope it is not the case, but there could be some consultant capture, as the industry would call it here. I would hope that we would move on to concrete projects – excuse the pun – in terms of a built environment context, rather than paying for a feasibility report. I am sure you will get that right going forward.

Louise Armstrong (Catalyst, The Peckham Coal Line): We were also mindful of that in designing the campaign as well. We were like, "No one wants to just fund a report. That is not what is exciting". We have done a whole bunch of events around this as well to engage people in part of the process so it is not just that.

Tony Devenish AM: Thank you.

Navin Shah AM (Chair): Thank you, Louise. We will move on to questions to be addressed to Spacehive.

Shaun Bailey AM (Deputy Chair): The question is effectively going to be: how does this whole thing work in London? Are there any particular London challenges, particularly when you are talking about changing parts of the built environment, just because of the pure cost of it all? I am in a slightly different place to my colleague. I could see how, if you are going to do consultation in the community centre, it would actually cost more, because that community needs education. I would just term some of that bill educational. I can see that. That is my point. Does it work any differently in London? Is London a special case? Are we especially good or especially bad? Is there something that the Mayor could do to aid the prevalence of this in London?

Niraj Dattani (Head of Community Development, Spacehive): Yes. We work across the country. We are a nationwide platform and we do work in other places as well, most notably Manchester, Hull, York. In many ways what is happening here in London is quite similar to how it works there. You have a pot of money that you put up as an authority, and you have objectives and criteria attached to that pot of money. Then a lot of work goes in on the ground to raise awareness around the opportunity for people to get involved, and a lot of work goes on behind the scenes to make the processes and everything else associated with accessing that money as easy as possible for people to access. In the structure of it, it is very similar.

The difference is London is quite unique just in the concentration of resources and creativity in the city, and what you see in London is a bit ahead of the game than elsewhere in the country. You can see that in the diversity of funders that you have for each project. Every single project that the Mayor backs that runs a crowdfunding campaign will have got a pledge from a local business and will have gone out and got help from another organisation. In most cases, after they have finished their campaign, they will have a relationship with people and organisations and companies who are willing to do things for them beyond their crowdfunding campaign. That is a glimpse into what crowdfunding could be.

There are challenges that are specific to London. Number one is working with your London boroughs. Here at City Hall, this programme is being run through the regeneration team. There are regeneration teams in every London borough, and they often work quite closely with City Hall. The first two rounds that they ran here came out of a fund where most of the fund was directed at local authorities in London, and a small part of the fund came to these crowdfunding projects. As part of the funding for those crowdfunding projects, these projects had to show that they were in line with the forward plans and objectives of the whole area. There is a bit there where it can be more joined up. In principle and in many other ways, the GLA and City Hall work with the London boroughs closely. In this part of their programme, they do not work that closely with the London boroughs. There are exceptions to this. Southwark Council, for instance, has funded the latest three projects that the Mayor has backed: both the Peckham Coal Line, the Peckham Lido, and, through another part of Southwark Council, Old Kent Road Studios. There is the potential for this joined-up working, and we work with many of the London boroughs, including Ealing. When we talk to them about it, they talk about how they would like to be more involved in this and how they would like to sync up their funding and sync up their priorities and objectives.

Shaun Bailey AM (Deputy Chair): Could I ask a question? Does that run the risk of the Mayor's priorities or the council priorities dominating, and the community only getting a bite if they do what we want to do and not what they actually had in mind?

Niraj Dattani (Head of Community Development, Spacehive): The reality is, whenever public money is involved, there are certain strings attached to that public money, and rightly so. With every single partner, they start out with their objectives, and that is what they put up and people respond to those objectives. The objectives are not so stringent that you say, "It has to be a playground with three swings, a roundabout and laminate flooring" or whatever. It is sufficiently flexible enough that people can respond in their own way. We have always encouraged our partners to be like that, and how we work with all of our partners is to make it as flexible and as broad as possible.

The other challenge specific to London is just all the bureaucracy, all the processes and all the due diligence that you have to go through as the Mayor. A lot of this is tied up with historic legacy governance, and I think there is an opportunity here to change that for these types of projects. When you are talking about lowering the barrier to entry - and I do not know if Louise [Armstrong] could comment on this - that is one of the barriers to entry. Apart from that, there are massive opportunities in London. We have a very creative city, a very wealthy city in many different ways. There is a lot of potential here in London, and really we are only at

the start of that. As Debbie [Jackson] mentioned earlier, this is being globally recognised as a World Government innovation. The types of things that you are alongside when it was recognised as that are things like rats being trained to sniff out landmines in Africa. That is what you are ranked alongside. You have done an amazing job in leading the way. Rightly so, London is a leading city in the world, but there is a lot more potential to go.

Shaun Bailey AM (Deputy Chair): Thank you for that very detailed answer. Just to zero in a little bit on Spacehive, Spacehive has been working *pro bono* with the CPP, but it is recognised this is not sustainable in the future. What costs do you think the programme would incur if this had to be done commercially, and how might that impact on the funds available?

Chris Gourlay (Founder and Chief Executive Officer, Spacehive): The context for us is we have been around for about five years. We are a social business, and this idea of trying to make regeneration for the many, rather than the few, to genuinely make this into an accessible, open experience for people is something we are extremely passionate about and is the focus of our work. When we came across the opportunity to work with the GLA to really refine this concept of how civic crowdfunding could work for ordinary people, for cities like London, it was extremely exciting for us. We were able to go through a process early on of effectively co-designing this approach with City Hall, and we were very happy to do that on a *pro bono* basis initially so that we could learn how to make this model function and test it out.

We are not working *pro bono* anymore. Less than a year ago we were commissioned to do a contract for this pilot, and we have had a fee of £30,000 - which is being paid in instalments - to help us deliver the activation, as we call it, so working with communities to help them develop ideas, supporting their ideas and supporting the Mayor in this work and so on. It is not a *pro bono* relationship anymore. That funding is, though, for the pilot, and of course there is a question about what happens beyond that point. The question of what the GLA does going forward is one for them, and they obviously are going to look at various different options. From our perspective, it is very open. There are options which involve almost no cost to the GLA, pure use of the software and nothing else, and there are options where they may wish us to do more work in helping to support the strategic development of the initiative and community engagement work and various other things. There will be a whole suite of choices that we can put forward as and when we get to the point that there is a decision to be made.

Shaun Bailey AM (Deputy Chair): Thank you.

Andrew Dismore AM: I just want to follow up with Niraj on some of the answers or questions that you had from Shaun [Bailey AM], and that is this. Involvement of local authorities and working with the priorities, effectively: how can we be sure that what is going on here is not simply plugging the gap caused by the cuts to the local authority budget?

Niraj Dattani (Head of Community Development, Spacehive): Great question. The types of projects that you get here will not necessarily have been the ones that local authorities would have funded. They will have funded that type of project. Wanstead is a great example, the Wanstead Playground project that Debbie [Jackson] mentioned earlier. London Borough of Redbridge was looking to redo this playground for a long time. It was talking to the local authority. The local authority said, "We cannot afford it".

Andrew Dismore AM: That is the point.

Niraj Dattani (Head of Community Development, Spacehive): Yes, so they did not want to fund the project. The community group came to an agreement with the council that they would take ownership over

redoing the playground as long as they had a maintenance arrangement with the council, and the council would keep maintaining it.

When it came down to designing that playground, that community group designed it in a completely different way to how the council was going to design it, and they went off and talked to local people. They were a group of mums themselves. They included facilities for disabled children and they included facilities for older children, because they knew that lots of older brothers and sisters would have to come down to the playground with their younger siblings. It ended up being a very different playground. While in a time the local authority may have funded it, it would have done it in its own way and it would have made its own type of playground. Here you are seeing a different type of playground emerge, one which has the backing of the community and one which has been designed in many ways with the community.

It is difficult to say whether this is something to bridge the cost, the reality is local authorities are funding these kinds of projects, and they are also under budgetary pressures. You are going to get a bit of that, but at the same time they are not the ones who are dictating what these projects look like or what these projects are. They are setting the broad parameters. In a lot of cases, they are reacting to what is happening. They are not coming along and saying, "We want to fund ten playgrounds in Redbridge. Come along with your ideas". They are seeing campaigns come up from the bottom up out of the ether, and they are reacting to it, and they recognise, "Hey, the public are behind this and we should be doing something".

Shaun Bailey AM (Deputy Chair): Can I just say I do not agree with your analysis, but I do not have that big of a problem with it? Ultimately, councillors are very canny. There are councillors now thinking, "I know how I can plug holes with A, B and C", and this would be on that list, but it is probably not that big a deal because they are quite good at responding to their residents in the first place. They probably are providing what their residents want. They are just finding another way to do it, I would suspect, but as a concept and as a group of professionals, you need to be focused on that. You need to look at it for what it is and make sure that it does not derail what you are doing. I feel like we have been slightly tough on you - I make no apology for that; that is our job - but I want you to understand, to my mind, this is a real innovation. This is important. When people internationally look at London, this is the kind of thing that makes them think we are leading in all the ways we are supposed to be leading. In this particular thing, I do think you need to look at more of what local authorities are setting as their priorities, because what you will find is, if they can find money for things, they will take that off their priority list and it will appear on yours. You just have to make sure that you and your other funders and the public involved are not particularly distressed by that.

Niraj Dattani (Head of Community Development, Spacehive): Yes, sure. That is a good point. The point that I was making about the regeneration departments is that in many instances - Debbie [Jackson] will know more about this than I do - the local authority, their regeneration department and City Hall are quite aligned already and they do lots of work together. With my councillor hat on, from our perspective, as a council, we want to make sure that services are delivered, that people enjoy living in their place, and the reality is we are under huge budgetary pressure, but the demand for nice playgrounds, nice high streets and thriving businesses in high streets is still there and it is not going away. You do have to try to make that happen somehow.

Navin Shah AM (Chair): Thank you. If we can move on to the next discussion, that is about the work undertaken on crowdfunding programmes in Ealing. Keith, would you like to very, very briefly introduce the work you are doing in this area in Ealing, and can you tell us why Ealing decided to use crowdfunding for the Transform Your Space project, and how does the programme complement the borough's conventional regeneration spending?

Keith Townsend (Executive Director, Environment and Customer Services, London Borough of Ealing): Thank you. I think it is fair to say this is a complementary project to an initiative which was really designed to start having a different conversation with our residents. We feel – it picks up the point that was raised just before – there is an interesting relationship between local government and its residents, potentially even more peculiar in London, which we think was a little bit too parental. Therefore, there was an opportunity for us to have a different dialogue and a different conversation with residents. In essence, our theory was around, was there an opportunity to have a different conversation with the residents to say, “It is your place, you live here, it is your neighbourhood. How can we facilitate and enable you to take a greater role in transforming that neighbourhood and looking after it into the future?”

I do not think that is necessarily just as a result of funding reductions in local authorities. It feels like a more mature way of the community and the local authority and other partners working in collaboration to make the place better so you achieve better outcomes. That was the theory. It is part of a wider community engagement piece of thinking that we were working on anyway.

At the same time, we had reformed the way in which our local democratic process worked between our ward councillors and our communities, and we had enabled that through elements of funding that effectively gave ward councillors some funding to deal with small-scale environmental projects in their ward and greater connect with residents. That has achieved significant successes, if nothing else than in terms of participations in the number of residents. You have those two initiatives running at the same time.

We had already embarked on the Transform Your Space initiative, and you have that in your papers, in terms of putting some funding in place with some simple criteria of saying, “There will be pieces of land that we are responsible for as a local authority, or not – it does not matter – that you want to improve, that you are passionate about, that you want to take some responsibility for”. We did not really want to put any more criteria than that. We connected those concepts together around a community management programme.

At the same time, we also wanted it to be sustainable. In an ideal world, our vision was around saying, “OK, how can we enable you to get funding, through all the sources of funding that may be available, and run that project and give you the capacity and the ability to do so, and look after it in the future because it is your project and you want to do that? Is that something that we could possibly achieve?” We felt initially that the Transform Your Space funding, the £625,000 that we referred to, would be a pump-primer for that. Working in collaboration with Niraj [Dattani] and his team, we effectively felt that that was a mechanism we could use to enable residents to start funding schemes as well as accessing the funding we had available. Much in the similar experience that the GLA had, we wanted to put some criteria around that, but we did not want to put folk off, because local authorities are great at developing criteria, and they are so complicated that the only people who understand it are the officers who developed it, which is a risk. We wanted to be relatively light-touch, which in itself is a risk, but enable residents to come up with the ideas themselves. We were not going to develop any of those ideas. They were conceptual ideas around improving a place and engaging residents, but the deal was you had to have a community on board and you had to have fundraised some money yourself and a way in which it could be looked after and maintained and developed into the future. It would not really just pass back to the local authority if it did not work. We were connecting all that together. That was the concept we put in place and launched in 2015 with the Transform Your Space initiative.

Again, picking up on some of the questions from some of my colleagues here, we effectively saw bids for projects coming from organisations that we had never heard of, community groups that formed around the back of this. They were not the traditional residents’ associations that I feel traditionally had the parental, argumentative relationship with the local authority on the basis of who shouted the loudest would end up with the money. None of those organisations participated in this scheme at all, which is really quite interesting. It

is a whole new group of people who are really engaged and really wanted to participate. Those that were successful – the examples of which are in the papers you have in front of you – were those that first had a good idea, secondly had people on board, had engaged the local residents that it impacted upon, and were really keen to do some things themselves.

What is quite unique about this, in answer to the question about how it can impact on broader regeneration, is scale. I think there is an opportunity to scale this up, but in terms of the volume of projects that could be delivered. Small-scale projects are difficult for the local authority to deliver. They are fiddly and they are quite difficult. Smaller-scale projects of around the £10,000, £20,000, £30,000, £40,000 mark, with a lot of volunteer input, with crowdfunding, can have a massive impact on that community. When you scale those up in volume, they can have a collectively very large impact and fulfil a need that is out there, and local authorities are not quite as fleet of foot as community groups could be to deliver them. Cumulatively, I think they create a massive opportunity for a borough and a place, full stop.

There is opportunity broadly for the nature and the type of those projects to move a little bit away potentially from being place-based environmental improvements projects, to more around community development, to more into projects involving initiatives to engage business and projects to engage wider community organisations in their place. We have not got there yet since we have been running this programme, but the third phase of our programme is literally about to start in a matter of three or four weeks' time. We are hopeful we may be able to evolve that, because we are not prescribing the type of projects that come from this too much. Hopefully that gives you a broad flavour of what our take on it is.

In terms of the numbers, I think you will see some of the numbers that are being pledged. A significant amount of external funding has come from this, from three sources, in the order of £250,000 versus our £650,000, bearing in mind we have not spent all of our £650,000 yet. The third wave has £200,000 left, so we are hopeful we will get more funding coming through. The bids scale from £2 from local residents to £50,000, which was from a Big Lottery Fund scheme that went up to £50,000, so we have had everything in between. In addition, the Spacehive connection has enabled it to get some sponsorship from organisations such as Experian and so on, who have connected with Spacehive because of its view on its corporate social responsibility. It connects in to projects that it likes the look of that meet its objectives too. Again, an opportunity going forward is: how can we engage businesses full stop in this?

I will give you a couple of other little examples of things that we are thinking about doing. We have a couple of other Transform project pots of capital funding available from the local authority. One is an area-based one for Ealing Town Centre and West Ealing Town Centre, which has £3.75 million in it for infrastructural improvements. We are thinking carefully about how we can connect that sort of project on that scale with our community aspirations and the crowdsourcing. We have a second one, which is an interesting one. We have about £500,000 for a programme called Transform Your Shopping Parade, which was designed to spruce up secondary and small-scale shopping areas to give businesses a bit of boost. Traditionally, they were very local and authority-run. Engineers designed good engineering schemes, as engineers always will. I would challenge whether they were sustainable into the future. Relatively limited engagement of businesses, so there is a big opportunity there, and we are thinking very carefully about how we can connect that initiative in the same way. How do we genuinely engage small and medium-sized local businesses and franchise businesses, which are a challenge for us, again, to maximise the benefit of that programme too and bring them all together?

Navin Shah AM (Chair): On the local funding you have had so far, do you reckon that that funding profile reflects the local diversity in Ealing?

Keith Townsend (Executive Director, Environment and Customer Services, London Borough of Ealing): Yes, it certainly does. If I had a map in front of me showing you where the projects came from, surprisingly, or not – I am not quite sure why – the more affluent areas did not necessarily engage in this initiative, for reasons that I do not really know. It was an open process and you would have expected that to have happened. One of our most successful projects was on a council-run estate from a community-based organisation, if success is judged by the value of that scheme, interestingly, yet we put no controls and mechanisms on that. Yes, we think the funding breadth is pretty diverse. Yes.

Navin Shah AM (Chair): If I can move on to my next question, do you see a role for crowdfunding in wider regeneration, one that goes beyond environmental improvement projects and into more capital-intensive schemes? You have somewhat touched upon it, but the capital investment and regeneration is what we are after.

Keith Townsend (Executive Director, Environment and Customer Services, London Borough of Ealing): I guess the issue in my view, in relation to that, is when you get to some of the very large-scale capital-intensive schemes that local authorities will be involved with, as will the GLA be involved with, I wonder if the scale of those may well dwarf and potentially put off particularly community-based organisations. Is there a risk that the scale of major infrastructural improvements will dwarf the smaller projects? Yet the smaller community-based initiatives can engage hundreds of people for hundreds of volunteer hours and, therefore, add huge amounts of value to those schemes. My instinct is potentially, yes, they ought to be part of wider regeneration schemes, but I think they need to recognise that if you are going to engage communities and small businesses in that process of regenerating a place, the scale probably needs to be smaller in order not to potentially put stakeholders off.

Navin Shah AM (Chair): Do Niraj [Dattani] or Debbie or Chris [Gourlay] have anything to add on your Ealing experience?

Debbie Jackson (Assistant Director, Regeneration, GLA): Yes. I am just interested to pick up on that last point there. It is important to remember – certainly from our perspective and what I understand about the Ealing experience – crowdfunding is only part of what we are talking about. It is the crowdsourcing as well. For me, that act of unlocking ideas and innovation from the community is central to what we have been working on. It also helps to address the challenge of: are you just doing what the public sector would do anyway or should do anyway? It is the innovation and the creativity, and perhaps different ways of doing things that the public sector would do. That is what is really interesting about this process, that it makes us question how we do things and whether there are better ways of doing things.

In terms of whether there is a role for crowdfunding in perhaps larger infrastructure projects and things like that, for me that starts to fall down because that is not crowdsourcing. In fact, it is just gap funding. It is not particularly inspirational and it is not getting the ideas from the community, and that does start to fall foul of the challenge that we have heard from the Committee in terms of whether you are just filling a gap that the public sector should fill. That becomes a lot more difficult to defend. For me, this is all about engaging Londoners in their city, unlocking their ideas, and then harnessing the resources of the crowd in the wider sense of that word. Yes, they are funding, but also their skills and their ideas around a particular idea or challenge, and that is what it is about for me. The money is just a little bit of the spectrum.

Chris Gourlay (Founder and Chief Executive Officer, Spacehive): The differentiation there is important in the sense that there is always going to be a role for strategic investment in grand and important infrastructure projects, whether that is housing or things like Crossrail and so on and so forth. I do not think that is the sweet spot for civic crowdfunding. This is almost like the civic equivalent of start-up funding in the

sense of: how can you create an ecology of ideas where we have lowered the barrier to entry for people to participate in civic improvement so much that the state does not need to be the gatekeeper to every single thing that takes place? Communities can come together, they can collaborate with businesses, with individuals, and just get things done. We have created a framework for that to happen that is safe and that is equitable and accessible.

There is a really interesting penumbra where, as you start to scale up those sorts of ideas, the state can collaborate with individuals on these sorts of ideas to do really quite ambitious and exciting things. It might well be that for something like the Peckham Coal Line, crowdfunding can help to get an idea off the ground that would not otherwise have done so, and we then pass the baton to a different form of funding that can help to take it the full way. In the same way that peer-to-peer lending and crowdfunding in the equity space and so on help to stimulate activity, we perhaps can do the same sort of thing in the civic environment. It is not a panacea, though.

Shaun Bailey AM (Deputy Chair): The Government would love it if you crowdfunded High Speed 2 (HS2).

Debbie Jackson (Assistant Director, Regeneration, GLA): It might take a while!

Navin Shah AM (Chair): We are talking about the Garden Bridge as well.

Debbie Jackson (Assistant Director, Regeneration, GLA): Let's not talk about the Garden Bridge.

Shaun Bailey AM (Deputy Chair): What future do you see crowdfunding has in supporting sustainable regeneration programmes in London, and do you see any drawbacks? Is there a scale issue? Is there an innovation that you have yet to get out into the public arena that might need to be made to allow crowdfunding to be part of London's regenerative story going into the future?

Debbie Jackson (Assistant Director, Regeneration, GLA): Shall I kick off? I am sure we will all have something to say, so I will try to keep it brief. At the risk of repeating myself, we do see crowdfunding and the broader participation of Londoners in regeneration as being central to what we do. It is a strong theme in the Mayor's manifesto as well, and that is something that we are very keen to build upon. I do think that it should have a central role.

Without a doubt, it takes time and skill and resources. It is challenging, and we should not underestimate that challenge. Niraj [Dattani] spoke a little bit about the bureaucracy. I did not wholly agree with everything he said, but we need to recognise it is public money; we cannot just push it out the door without having some sort of responsibility to that public money. Aligning that responsibility with the necessity for crowdfunding to be quick and smart and easy with as few clicks as possible is a real challenge for us, and it is a challenge for the processes of City Hall. We have come a long way and we still have some way to go, but I think it is what we should be doing.

Londoners welcome it. We have done some survey work through Talk London. From 800 respondents of mixed backgrounds, 40% indicated they were already involved in some level of community group activity, and nearly 80% believed that the role of community groups should go beyond just consultation. There is a real appetite and expectation from Londoners that they can and should be involved in their local communities and what happens to their local communities. That, together with the possibilities of the digital world and new ways of financing things, does create - we have spoken about sweet spots - a sweet spot for us to demonstrate this innovation and set a bit of an example as against cities across the world as well.

I will pause, because everyone else will have an opinion on this.

Chris Gourlay (Founder and Chief Executive Officer, Spacehive): Look at the city: millions of people, an extraordinary amount of wealth, an extraordinary amount of creativity. If we can find a way for people to come together to improve places in a way that benefits the local economy and benefits quality of life, we are tapping into an enormous seam potentially of self-interest that can be mobilised for the public good. We have just started to scratch the surface of that potential. There are about £3 million of projects delivered across this city. There is absolutely no reason why we cannot have an ecology of hundreds of millions of pounds' worth of improvements at massive small-scale, if you like. Many, many, many constant local improvements are taking place in neighbourhoods around the capital. The work that we have tried to do with City Hall here is to look at that tough business of really thinking about, what are the mechanisms? What are the processes? What is the culture that is going to make that possible and appealing for people? If we get it right, there is no reason why it should not become culturally accepted, culturally normal, for citizens and businesses to be collaborating with local authorities, with the GLA and with other stakeholders to do these sorts of projects. The potential, if we can get that right, is not just about quality of life, as has been discussed today. It is about bringing communities together. It is about making people feel connected to the story of London's regeneration and to dilute that feeling of adversarialism which can sometimes bubble up in relation to the business of change, and to create a platform where you genuinely have a way of building more resilient communities who are able to fulfil their aspirations and their potential. The early signs of this are that there is a real appetite for this and that we can deliver real benefits off the back of these individual projects for people who are willing to step up and get involved.

To come back on this point about cuts and the context of this, this is really important to understand because it is not an either/or model. This is not about the state withdrawing and communities being given this responsibility. It is us coming together to do this as a city, and everybody is part of this.

Shaun Bailey AM (Deputy Chair): Thank you. A small additional question. What does the GLA need to do to get the most out of this community-led project, not just the crowdfunding end of it? The funding is what it is, but you made a comment about it being part of helping the business of change. The one thing that London has always been is in a perpetual state of change. Words like 'gentrification' have always been thrown about. Is there something that the GLA can do or the Mayor can do or local authorities can do to help this become a cultural norm, just for that - I want to use the word 'simpler' - to happen, to propagate it?

Chris Gourlay (Founder and Chief Executive Officer, Spacehive): Yes, I think there is huge potential here. We are just reaching the end of the co-design process with this pilot and there is more work to be done, but once we have finished establishing the model for this and have considered the optimal way to engage communities, to reach into areas perhaps where they do not automatically get involved, to think about the systems and processes and all the other bits that go with it, we will have the opportunity to really turn up the marketing side of things, the profile side of things. There is enormous potential to make this feel like a genuinely open call for ideas from Londoners by the Mayor, where people feel tremendously inspired to come forward with suggestions for how they can improve their places. They will feel excited to be able to collaborate with City Hall and businesses and Network Rail and all these other people that you would not necessarily be able to deal with normally as a citizen. If we can create a culture where there is that big, warm, open call and where people are encouraged to think creatively and come forward with suggestions, you will have mass participation in this. There are a lot of standard levers that can be pulled in terms of marketing and public relations (PR), and just the personal involvement of the Mayor to really get London's citizens, but also the business community, involved in helping to make this a widespread activity.

Debbie Jackson (Assistant Director, Regeneration, GLA): I just wanted to, in answering this question, reassure the Committee that some of the challenges that were being articulated earlier on in terms of inclusion and reaching communities are something that we very much are aware of. It is exactly why we commissioned the report that you were sent and have referred to today, and we will be taking the recommendations of that into account and we are continuing to work with GLA Intelligence on that work stream.

In that light, the role of us as the GLA and the local authorities is very much around putting the programme under the spotlight, both in terms of helping us to spread the message that the opportunity is there, but also telling the stories of what has been achieved. There is a nervousness about getting involved – “I can’t do it” – and there are so many really compelling stories. One of the other things that we are doing is developing a peer-to-peer network among the crowdfunded projects, the 53 that are on our books at the moment. There is a role within the public sector network in London to promote the opportunity and tell the story of what has been achieved.

There is also something around capacity building. We will put effort into that and we will make resources available to local groups, but local authorities, as has already been said, know their communities better than anybody. If we can align resources and support across our organisations to help develop the capacity of local groups to engage with the programme as well, it will just make the effort and resources we put into that work a lot harder, if we can align our programmes as well.

The other thing that the public sector needs to do is think about our processes and our proportionality. Some of our processes are still designed for £3 million grants, which is not massively helpful for a £15,000 project. It is about of course looking after public money, but being proportionate in how we approach that. That is something we, as I said, have come a long way on, but there is undoubtedly more that we could do.

Louise Armstrong (Catalyst, The Peckham Coal Line): Just to echo what Debbie was saying, there is a need to connect up people who are running and driving these projects. As someone that has done it, it is really hard. Yes, it is possible, but it is not without difficulty. Having that support and connection to people who have done it before I think will be really, really valuable, and the role local authorities or the GLA can play in matchmaking is really, really valuable. Plugging the skills gap in areas that do not necessarily have the skills to drive that right now; it is great to hear that that is being explored, and there is a real need for it if we are going to scale this up.

Keith Townsend (Executive Director, Environment and Customer Services, London Borough of Ealing): If I could just add to my colleague’s comments there from a local authority perspective, what local authorities can do is be a bit braver with it. The bureaucracy is not necessary. It genuinely is not. It is a culture of invented, self-perpetuating risk that I am unconvinced exists. Having taken criteria away and kept it very broad, it kept the opportunities open to a breadth of people which meant we did not exclude people. We got a better result out of it and I think it has proven that. It is also around challenging local authority culture around traditional ways of doing things. That parental relationship that some local authorities can have with their residents is also internally perpetuating at times because it is the safe way of doing it, because it is the way it has been done for the last 35 years. Encouraging and leading the local authority organisations to enable their front line folk to think differently and take the risks away from them and the fear away from them is a massive enabler. This has to be the way of doing business going forward because it unleashes a level of resource and energy and commitment towards improving the local areas that is greater than exists within the local authority’s gift. It would seem foolish not to. There are risks and there are things that can be learned from it. I think we can engage businesses better in participating in that. That is our local experience, and we need to come up with clever ways of doing that, learning from what colleagues have done elsewhere, I guess.

That is the general thing I would do, to be brave with it, and local authorities have to take a few risks. Those risks are not really that huge, I do not think, given the scale.

Debbie Jackson (Assistant Director, Regeneration, GLA): Sorry, there is a point that I would like the Committee to hear, and it is a bit of a plea. The kind of money that we have for this programme has been capital funding, and we have worked very hard to make our capital funding deliver on broader aims, but there is a limit to how much capacity building and awareness raising we can do with the wrong kind of money. Do not get me wrong, I will happily spend capital money, but it works a lot better if we have revenue funding to go alongside capital funding as well because otherwise everything we have talked about – communicating, capacity building, all of those activities – we cannot do because we do not have the funding available. There is just always an ongoing plea from my world that if I get 100% capital it is very difficult to do the stuff that really makes it sing. I just need to park that point.

Navin Shah AM (Chair): I think that is a fair comment and something that does need to be looked at by all concerned, so I accept that. I have a couple of concluding questions for a response from our guests. The first point is, what opportunities do you reckon there are to expand the programme across London? You already heard comments and criticism, concerns that it is not quite reaching out to the wider areas of London, like outer London boroughs. Some examples were cited. This goes for both the Mayor and the boroughs. Could I have brief comments on those.

Debbie Jackson (Assistant Director, Regeneration, GLA): Shall I kick off again?

Navin Shah AM (Chair): Do you want to start?

Debbie Jackson (Assistant Director, Regeneration, GLA): I feel like I have to on that question, don't I? I accept those observations about the reach of the programme so far, and we do hope to be able to expand the programme and scale up the programme. As I said, we are waiting on announcements and the funding, but all being well we hope to be able to, in effect, consolidate our learning and launch a Mayor's Crowdfund – working title – in the new year. In doing so, it will be ideally positioned under the Mayor's strong priority around #LondonIsOpen because it genuinely provides an opportunity for Londoners to engage in the shaping of their local communities.

Andrew Dismore AM: Will this be Round 4?

Debbie Jackson (Assistant Director, Regeneration, GLA): It will be Round 4, but if we get more funding, in effect, it will be the beginning of a future programme.

Andrew Dismore AM: Wasn't Round 4 supposed to be this autumn?

Debbie Jackson (Assistant Director, Regeneration, GLA): It is going to be launched in the new year now. It will be launched in January [2017] now. We are still in the middle of Round 3 at the moment. In terms of what we need to do in order to do that, we have talked about the relationship with Spacehive. When we began this programme, if we had have procured a platform, we would not have known what to write in the brief because we did not know what we wanted. We have learned a huge amount through this process, and one of the things that we will be looking at is how we develop a platform that is fit for purpose. Perhaps that will be with Spacehive. This is a conversation that we will continue to have. They are more than aware of our responsibility to procure openly, aren't you? That will be one of the things that we will be looking at, and we will be thinking about how that relates to the City Hall website as well. The technical platform and how that gets delivered and what capability that has is one of the things that we are looking at.

We are looking at scale of projects, whether we have the opportunity to do projects at different scales. So far we have been at one very small scale. Then, in terms of convening the crowd and that promotion, engagement and sharing of best practice, that is a really strong work theme for us. Like I said, that is why we commissioned that work. In an ideal world, if I can get enough revenue funding, there will be a wraparound support package around the crowdfunding platform itself, so we would look to be bringing all of those activities for a launch in the new year, hopefully.

Niraj Dattani (Head of Community Development, Spacehive): Yes. I think there are any number of opportunities out there, but the ones that spring to mind: most obviously there is lots of stuff even within your own four walls. Within the GLA there are lots of different teams. We have seen the Food team now join the Regeneration team in funding these types of projects. The Food team have dipped their toes in the water with it a bit. There is no reason why they could not do that a bit more. Maybe there are other teams within City Hall, like Cultural, Environment, Sports. They could all be getting involved in this and add to the diversity of the projects that are funded.

There is the obvious point about the boroughs which I have mentioned a few times. You are right and you do have a point about the inner London and the outer London bit. If I think about the number of boroughs that we have worked with over the past few years, we are missing a whole ring on outer London, with the exception of Croydon. You will not find many boroughs that are engaging with crowdfunding at the moment, and maybe that is part of the reason why you are not seeing many projects come forward in these rounds. There is an opportunity there to do a bit more awareness-raising and stand behind crowdfunding as a model for these boroughs to engage with. Coming to Keith's [Townsend] point about the risk-averseness and the cautiousness around this, if the Mayor were to proactively go around to these boroughs and say, "Hey, this is good enough for us", then you might see a bit more pickup from those outer London boroughs.

There is obviously the private sector. There are lots of opportunities there in the private sector. We work with housing associations, brands and businesses of all kinds. There is an opportunity there to use the clout of the GLA to engage with them more and get them more excited about their fund. There are all sorts of projects on our platform. Thinking about what Debbie is saying about the scale, this is just a personal opinion, but I think she is thinking big, as people in regeneration obviously do and are meant to.

Debbie Jackson (Assistant Director, Regeneration, GLA): I do not know what I am thinking!

Niraj Dattani (Head of Community Development, Spacehive): I always think that it would be great if we could have lots of smaller types of projects. Even though for the Regeneration team pledges of up to £20,000 are probably considered small, for community groups that is a sizeable chunk of money. I think if we could have lots of maybe £2,000 projects, £5,000 projects coming through the system, that whole culture of this becoming the norm would be a lot more prevalent.

Louise Armstrong (Catalyst, The Peckham Coal Line): I just want to almost reiterate what Keith was saying earlier about this contributing to changing the relationship between citizens in London and the authorities and how it has a massive part to play in that. That is really exciting, and let's not forget that bigger conversation that crowdfunding is being a spearhead for. As a citizen of London who has been enabled through this process, I am really excited about where that can go and what that can provide other people.

Keith Townsend (Executive Director, Environment and Customer Services, London Borough of Ealing): I would reaffirm the same point, as I think this is the way in which local authorities in London have to start thinking around this to complement existing programmes. It is not a substitution for other things. It is

not going to pay for massive infrastructure projects, but as an addition and an add-on and filling a gap that the local authorities are going to struggle to fulfil anyway and always have struggled to fulfil, the opportunity is too good to waste in terms of small projects and building on small projects *en masse*, just making it a common way in which government in London operates, engaging the citizens of London. I think we would be mad to not try to scale it up.

Navin Shah AM (Chair): Final question. We will start with Debbie. We talked about the current programme leading up to 2017/18. We started thinking beyond that period, given the success of the projects and the other aspirations you have indicated, like revenue-funded projects etc. Have you started looking beyond 2017 and 2018, and just generally, what role is there for the Mayor to build on the success of the programme so far?

Debbie Jackson (Assistant Director, Regeneration, GLA): Yes is the answer to the first question. We are looking beyond 2017/18, and in fact what we would like to do is establish an ongoing programme that works in much more of a rolling way. At the moment we have deadlines that have to be met, and what we would like to do is, in effect, make this a part of the core business of City Hall that citizens can engage with at any point. We need to think about how we organise ourselves to do that. Obviously we need the funding to do that. If the funding gets announced, it hopefully will indicate a four-year profile, so we will very much make plans on the basis of a four-year profile. Yes, we certainly do not see this as a short or medium-term opportunity, but we would like to continue to learn. We have been very clear about that in our experience so far, and I think that needs to continue to be a feature. Not even these guys know where the landscape is going to be in four years' time, so it is really important that we remain flexible and we learn.

In terms of the role of the Mayor to build on the successes of the programme so far, I have touched a little bit on the programme and how we may deliver going forward. There is a huge role for the Mayor to promote this opportunity. It is very complementary to the current campaign and the narrative around #LondonIsOpen, and it is something that every local community can engage with.

There is also an opportunity that we have not really discussed today for using this as an opportunity to collaborate with partners across the public, private and third sector as well. It is not only a tool to engage with the community but it is a tool to bring the commercial - London's businesses - closer to the community as well. That is something that we have not really explored so far. That is a really interesting development that we could look at, and other funding streams as well, charities, and the idea being that once the architecture for the system and the platform is set up, it provides us with a stable basis in order to have those kinds of conversations and understand how businesses want to engage with communities. We could work with them on that. There is quite a significant convening power the Mayor can have, not just for citizens but for London's broader community as well.

Navin Shah AM (Chair): Louise, do you want to say anything on this?

Louise Armstrong (Catalyst, The Peckham Coal Line): I do not think I do at this stage. Thank you.

Navin Shah AM (Chair): Niraj? Chris? Keith?

Chris Gourlay (Founder and Chief Executive Officer, Spacehive): No, other than just to build on what Debbie is saying. My sense is that as this develops, the Mayor is going to discover that City Hall can play an extremely powerful role in shaping a culture and enabling people to participate, inspiring people to participate, mobilising the wealth and the creativity which is out there in the city but which is currently latent, not accessible to people who are doing civic improvement, and to become the guardian of fairness in the ecology that develops. As this thing starts to grow, you will see more and more people come forward with ideas. You

will see more and more different types of funder contribute to civic improvement. The Mayor has the most extraordinary role to play in mobilising and inspiring that activity, but also ensuring that it is a process which is accessible and where participation is fair and evenly distributed among London's communities. We talked about the business community. That is a powerful example of what is possible. There is tremendous appetite out there from businesses to contribute to these sorts of ideas. We have already seen how thousands of them have been involved without any encouragement in helping these sorts of projects to happen across London. There is a massive opportunity there to align their interests with the interests of communities while genuinely putting communities in the driving seat of change.

Navin Shah AM (Chair): Thank you very much. This does bring us to the conclusion of our deliberations. I would like to thank all of you for your very positive input and look forward to progressing this piece of work. Thank you very much for your attendance this afternoon.